REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant AMENDS claims 1 and 10 and CANCELS claims 12 and 13.

Claims 1, 2, 5, and 8-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al. (U.S. 6,411,314) in view of Higgins et al. (U.S. 5,835,627). Claims 3, 4, 6, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al. and Higgins et al., and further in view of Shakespeare (U.S. 6,421,575).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 1-15.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

> A job control system for controlling a job in a document processing system in which processing system a number of tasks is performed in a workflow, the job control system comprising an input source with a user interface for enabling a user to define and change a set of parameters selected from the group of first parameters for said workflow and second parameters within said workflow, wherein the job control system comprises:
>
> an identifier to identify and mark dependencies of results of said job to parameters, wherein said results are selected from the group of intermediate results of said job and final results of said job, and wherein said parameters are selected from the group of parameters for said workflow, parameters within said workflow, and parameters for individual task processors in a production plan defining processing of said job;
>
> **a verifier to verify, during job execution, a change in a particular parameter out of said parameters, and to determine a condition if (a) a particular result out of said results and obtained before said change in said particular parameter is independent of said particular parameter**, or (b) if an effect of said change in said particular parameter on said particular result is within a given limit; so that said particular result is still useable despite said change in said particular parameter;
>
> a memory for storing the still useable results; and
>
> **a controller arranged to reuse said particular result only when said verifier has determined that the condition has been met**. (emphasis added)

Applicant's claim 10 has been amended to recite features and method steps that are similar to the features recited in Applicant's claim 1, including the above-emphasized features.

The Examiner alleged that Hansen teaches a job control system including an

identifier and a verifier. The Examiner acknowledged that Hansen does not teach a verifier as recited in claims 1 and 10, or a memory for storing the results. The Examiner alleged that Higgins et al. teaches a verifier wherein if a result is obtained before a change to a parameter that is independent of the result, then the result would remain unchanged. The Examiner further alleged that "the image quality function value determination unit and parameter optimization element [of Higgins et al.] would not adjust anything in the result and keep the result intact" (see the second paragraph on page 2 of the outstanding Office Action).

Applicant has amended claim 1, and similarly claim 10, to recite the feature of "a controller arranged to reuse said particular result only when said verifier has determined that the condition has been met." Support for this feature is found, for example, in paragraphs [044] and [088] of Applicant's originally filed specification.

In contrast, as explained on pages 8 and 9 of Applicant's Amendment filed November 6, 2008, Higgins et al. merely teaches a process for automatically optimizing the quality of an output image using a modulation transfer function chain 122 and a Wiener noise spectrum chain 123 based on a customer satisfaction index (CSI) (see, for example, column 2, lines 39-45 of Higgins et al.). The modulation transfer function chain 122 and the Wiener noise spectrum chain 123 operations of Higgins et al. are repeated through a series of iterations using updated parameter values until the parameter optimization element 125 determines that the parameter values meet a termination criterion, in which case the iterations are stopped and the final parameter values are output to the image data processing section 20 (see, for example, column 23, lines 31-50 of Higgins et al.).

According to the Examiner, if the result of Higgins et al. is obtained before the change to the parameter, and the result is independent of the parameter, then the result will never change. While this may be true, Applicant respectfully submits that this is not relevant to Applicant's claimed invention. This is because Higgins et al. does not teach or suggest a verifier *to determine* if the result is independent of the parameter. For example, according to the process of Higgins et al., if a parameter is changed, an

iteration is still performed using the changed parameter regardless of whether or not the result is independent of the parameter (see, for example, column 23, lines 23-50 of Higgins et al.). That is, Higgins et al. does not teach or suggest *not* performing an iteration because it has been determined, before performing the iteration, that the iteration will not generate a different result. Consequently, Higgins et al. cannot possibly teach or suggest reusing the result when it has been determined that the result is independent of the changed parameter.

Thus, the combination of Hansen et al. and Higgins et al. clearly fails to teach or suggest the features of "a verifier to verify, during job execution, a change in a particular parameter out of said parameters, and to determine a condition if (a) a particular result out of said results and obtained before said change in said particular parameter is independent of said particular parameter" and "a controller arranged to reuse said particular result only when said verifier has determined that the condition has been met," as recited in Applicant's claim 1, and similarly in Applicant's claim 10.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al. in view of Higgins.

The Examiner relied upon Shakespeare to allegedly cure deficiencies of Hansen et al. and Higgins et al. However, Shakespeare clearly fails to teach or suggest the features of "a verifier to verify, during job execution, a change in a particular parameter out of said parameters, and to determine a condition if (a) a particular result out of said results and obtained before said change in said particular parameter is independent of said particular parameter" and "a controller arranged to reuse said particular result only when said verifier has determined that the condition has been met," as recited in Applicant's claim 1, and similarly in Applicant's claim 10. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Shakespeare fails to cure the deficiencies of Hansen et al. and Higgins et al. described above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Hansen et al., Higgins et al., and Shakespeare, applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique

combination and arrangement of features and method steps recited in Applicant's claims 1 and 10.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 10 are allowable. Claims 2-9, 11, 14, and 15 depend upon claims 1 and 10, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claims 1 and 10 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 24, 2009

/Stephen R. Funk #57,751/
Attorneys for Applicant

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
1800 Alexander Bell Drive, Suite 200
Reston, VA 20191
Telephone: (571) 313-7440
Facsimile: (571) 313-7421

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Stephen R. Funk
Registration No. 57,751